arXiv:1402.0293v1 [math.OC] 3 Feb 2014

Sufficiency Condition for KKT Points in Non-smooth Analysis

February 4, 2014

S. R. Pattanaik [1]

Abstract

In this article we consider a convex feasible set described by inequality constraints that are continuous and not necessarily Lipschitz or convex. We show that if the Slater constraint qualification and a non-degeneracy condition are satisfied, then the Karush-Kuhn-Tucker type optimality condition is both necessary and sufficient. In this way we extend previous results which are proved for Lipschitz and differentiable inequalities.

keywords:Convex optimization, KKT conditions, Non-smooth functions
AMS class: 58E17, 65K10, 90C25

1 Introduction

Traditionally, Convex optimization refers to minimizing a convex function over a convex feasible set described by convex inequalities. Ben-Tal and Nemirovsky [1] show that convex optimization requires only convex feasible set without precising its representation, i.e., convex inequalities. It is well-known that convexity of the minimizing function and feasible set imply that every local minimum is global minimum and derivation of this fact uses only the geometry of the feasible set not its representation. However, in convex programming problems, the celebrated Karush-Kuhn-Tucker optimality condition depends on the representation of the feasible set. A crucial feature of convex optimization is that with Slater's condition, the KKT optimality

[1]Department of Mathematics, National Institute of Technology, Rourkela, India
E-mail: suvendu.pattanaik@gmail.com

condition is both necessary and sufficient. Therefor, representation of the convex set is very vital for convex programming problems.

Lasserre [4, 5] provides an interesting result that with Slater's condition and a mild non-degeneracy condition, KKT optimality condition is both necessary and sufficient for a convex feasible set described by inequalities which are differentiable but not necessarily convex. Hence, it implies that KKT point is the global minimizer when the minimizing function and feasible set is convex with the above mentioned mild condition and Slater's condition. This shows that as far as attractive feature related to KKT point is concerned that is not restricted to the specific representation of feasible set but its geometry.

Dutta and Lalitha [3] extend the purview of Lasserre [4] to the feasible set described by inequalities which are locally Lipschitz and regular in the sense of Clarke [2] and put two questions for further researches. First, whether the assumption of regularity can be removed from [3] and second, whether it can be extended to a sharper necessary and sufficient optimality condition using basic limitting subdifferential [6]. Sharper results are required as Clarke's subdifferential, through which necessary optimality condition is derived in [3], is whole set $\mathbb{R}^n$ in some cases, which is illustrated in example **??**.

In this note, the questions raised by Dutta and Lalitha [3] are settled using sharper subdifferential, i.e., Fréchet upper subdifferential. The reason behind using Fréchet upper subdifferential is that KKT type optimality condition for feasible set described by non-smooth and non-convex inequalities exists only through Fréchet upper subdifferential [7]. Additionally, we apprise that Fréchet upper subdifferential is more compatible with maximization problems than minimization problems and for concave function it reduces to classical upper subdifferential [6, 8]. In [5] Lassrre consider a feasible set described by concave and differentiable function. However, maximization problems can be converted to minimization problems easily. Consider the following concave optimization problem (CP):

$$\max f(x), \quad \text{subject to} \quad x \in K;$$

where $f : \mathbb{R}^n \to \mathbb{R}$ is a continuous concave function (-f is convex) and $K \subset \mathbb{R}^n$ is a convex set. We assume that the feasible set K of (CP) is given as

$$K = \Big\{ x \in \mathbb{R}^n : g_i(x) \geq 0, \quad i = 1, \ldots, m \Big\}, \tag{1.1}$$

where each $g_i : \mathbb{R}^n \to \mathbb{R}$ is continuous function but not necessarily convex or Lipschitz function. Further, we assume problem (CP) satisfies Slater constraint qualification condition, i.e., there exists $\hat{x} \in \mathbb{R}^n$ such that $g_i(\hat{x}) >$

0 for all $i = 1, \ldots, m$. In section 2, we provide require notion and preliminary for proving main results and in section 3, main results are proved.

2 Preliminaries

Let $K \subset \mathbb{R}^n$ be convex and $x \in K$. Then normal cone to K at x is defined as

$$N_K(x) = \Big\{ v \in \mathbb{R}^n : \langle v, y - x \rangle \leq 0 \quad \forall y \in \mathbb{R}^n \Big\}.$$

We say that $w \in \mathbb{R}^n$ is a direction tangent to K at x when there exists a sequence $\{x_k\} \subset K$ and a sequence t_k such that, when $k \to \infty$, $x_k \to x, t_k \downarrow 0$, $\frac{x_k - x}{t_k} \to w$. The set of all direction tangent is called as tangent cone and denoted as $T_K(x)$. Also from proposition 6.5 [8], we obtain that $v \in N_K(x)$ if and only if $\langle v, w \rangle \leq 0$ for all $w \in T_K(x)$. The subdifferential of the convex function $f : \mathbb{R}^n \to \mathbb{R}$ at $x \in \mathbb{R}^n$ is the set $\partial f(x)$ given as

$$\partial f(x) = \Big\{ v \in \mathbb{R}^n : f(y) - f(x) \geq \langle v, y - x \rangle, \quad \text{for all} \quad y \in \mathbb{R}^n \Big\}.$$

Each member of $\partial f(x)$ is called as a subgradient of f at x. The regular subdifferential of a continuous function f at $\bar{x}$ defined as

$$\hat{\partial} f(\bar{x}) = \Big\{ v | f(x) \geq f(\bar{x}) + \langle v, x - \bar{x} \rangle + o(\|x - \bar{x}\|) \quad \text{for all} \quad x \in \mathbb{R}^n \Big\}, \quad (2.1)$$

where the term $o(\|x - \bar{x}\|)$ with the property that $o(\|x - \bar{x}\|)/\|x - \bar{x}\| \to 0$ when $x \to \bar{x}$ with $x \neq \bar{x}$. Each element of $\hat{\partial} f(\bar{x})$ is called as a regular subgradient. According to Proposition 8.12 [8], for convex function, regular subdifferential reduces to subdifferential. For more on regular subdifferential, one may refer [8]. Fréchet upper subdifferential or upper subdifferential $\hat{\partial}^+ f(\bar{x}) = -\hat{\partial}(-f)(\bar{x})$ of f at $\bar{x}$ is defined as

$$\hat{\partial}^+ f(\bar{x}) = \Big\{ v \in \mathbb{R}^n | \limsup_{x \to \bar{x}} \frac{f(x) - f(\bar{x}) - \langle v, x - \bar{x} \rangle}{\| x - \bar{x} \|} \leq 0 \Big\}, \quad (2.2)$$

which is same as

$$\hat{\partial}^+ f(\bar{x}) = \Big\{ v \in \mathbb{R}^n | f(x) - f(\bar{x}) - \langle v, x - \bar{x} \rangle \leq o(\| x - \bar{x} \|) \Big\}.$$

It is easy to check that $\hat{\partial}^+(\lambda f)(x) = \lambda \hat{\partial}^+ f(x)$ for $\lambda < 0$ [6]. For more on Fréchet upper subdifferential, one may refer [8]. Before proceeding further

we formally state necessary optimality condition for problem (CP) Karush-Kuhn-Tucker (KKT) condition for problem (CP) using Theorem 5.19 of Mordukhovich [7] which is defined for minimization constraints problems. The point $\bar{x} \in K$ is said to be KKT point of the problem (CP) if there exists scalars $\lambda_i \geq 0, i = 1, \ldots, m$ such that

(i) $0 \in \hat{\partial}^+(-f)(\bar{x}) + \sum_{i=1}^m \lambda_i \hat{\partial}^+(-g_i)(\bar{x})$

(ii) $\lambda_i g_i(\bar{x}) = 0, \quad \forall i = 1, 2, \ldots, m.$

We remind that since Problem (CP) is a maximization problem we have taken $-f$ and $-g_i$ in above KKT condition.

3 Main Results

Definition 1 *Consider the problem (CP). We say that the assumption (A) holds if*

$$0 \notin -\hat{\partial}^+ g_i(x), \quad \textit{whenever} \quad x \in K \quad \textit{and} \quad g_i(x) = 0.$$

Lemma 2 *Assume that* $\langle v, y - x\rangle \leq -o(\|y - x\|)$ *for all* $y \in K$. *Then* $v \in N_K(x)$ *where* K *is a convex set.*

Proof: Assume $w \in T_K(x)$. Then there exists sequence $\{t_k\}$ and $\{w_k\}$ with $t_k \to 0$ such that $\frac{x_k - x}{t_k} \to w$, where $x_k = x + t_k w_k$ and $x_k \in K$. Putting x_k in the place of y of assumption we get

$$\langle v, t_k w_k\rangle \quad \leq \quad -o(t_k w_k)$$

By taking $k \to \infty$, we get

$$\langle v, w\rangle \quad \leq \quad 0$$

Since K is convex, it implies $v \in N_K(x)$. Hence result. □

Proposition 3 *Let the set* K *be given as in the problem (CP). Assume that Slater constraint qualification and the assumption (A) hold. Then* K *is convex if and only if for every* $i = 1, 2 \ldots m$,

$$-\hat{\partial}^+ g_i(\bar{x}) \subset N_K(\bar{x}) \quad \textit{for all} \quad \bar{x} \quad \textit{with} \quad g_i(\bar{x}) = 0. \tag{3.1}$$

Proof: Let us assume that K is convex and $-v \in \hat{\partial}^+ g_i(\bar{x})$ which is same as $v \in \hat{\partial}(-g_i)(\bar{x})$. From Definition (2.1), we get

$$\begin{aligned} \langle v, x - \bar{x} \rangle + o(\|x - \bar{x}\|) &\leq -g_i(x) + g_i(\bar{x}) \quad \text{for all} \quad x \in K \\ &\leq -g_i(x) \end{aligned}$$

Last inequality follows from the assumption $g_i(\bar{x}) = 0$ for all $i = 1, 2, \ldots, m$. Since $x \in K$, it implies that $g_i(x) \geq 0$. We get

$$\langle v, x - \bar{x} \rangle \leq -o(\|x - \bar{x}\|) \quad \text{for all} \quad x \in K.$$

It implies that $v \in N_K(\bar{x})$ from Lemma (2) . For converse part, suppose that $v_i \in -\hat{\partial}^+ g_i(\bar{x}) \subset N_K(\bar{x})$. Then we will get

$$\langle v_i, x - \bar{x} \rangle \leq 0 \quad \text{for all} \quad x \in K.$$

From Slater constraint condition and assumption (A) we will get K is non empty and $v_i \neq 0$ respectively. Thus there exists a non-trivial supporting hyperplane to the set K at x. Hence from Theorem 1.3.3 of Schneider [9] we get that K is convex. □

One can easily check that Proposition (3) reduces to proposition 2.2 [3] when g_i's are locally Lipschitz continuous.

Theorem 4 *Let us consider the problem (CP). Assume that the Slater constraint qualification holds and the assumption (A) is satisfied. Then $\bar{x} \in K$ is a global minimizer of f over K if and only if it is a KKT point.*

Proof: Let $\bar{x} \in K$ be a minimizer of f over K. Then from Theorem 5.19 of [7], there exists $\lambda_0 \geq 0, \lambda_1 \geq 0, \ldots, \lambda_m \geq 0$ not all simultaneously zero such that

$$0 \in \lambda_0 \hat{\partial}^+(-f)(\bar{x}) + \sum_{i=1}^{m} \lambda_i \hat{\partial}^+(-g_i)(\bar{x}) \tag{3.2}$$

and

$$\lambda_i g_i(\bar{x}) = 0, \quad \text{for all} \quad i = 1, 2, \ldots, m. \tag{3.3}$$

Equation 3.2 implies that there exist $x_0^* \in \hat{\partial}^+(-f)(\bar{x})$ and $x_i^* \in \hat{\partial}^+(-g_i)(\bar{x})$ such that

$$\lambda_0 x_0^* + \sum_{i=1}^{m} \lambda_i x_i^* = 0 \tag{3.4}$$

Now, we shall show that $\lambda_0 > 0$ by using assumption (A) and Slater constraint qualification condition. Assume that $\lambda_0 = 0$, then equation (3.2) will reduces to

$$0 \in \sum_{i=1}^{m} \lambda_i \hat{\partial}^+(-g_i)(\bar{x}). \tag{3.5}$$

Define $I = \Big\{ i | \lambda_i > 0, i = 1, 2, \ldots, m \Big\}$. I is nonempty as we have already assumed that $\lambda_0 = 0$. Then equation (3.5) will further reduce to

$$0 \in \sum_{i \in I} \lambda_i \hat{\partial}^+(-g_i)(\bar{x}). \tag{3.6}$$

and

$$\lambda_i g_i(\bar{x}) = 0, \quad \text{for all} \quad i \in I. \tag{3.7}$$

From equation (3.6), we get

$$0 = \sum_{i \in I} \lambda_i x_i^*. \tag{3.8}$$

Since the Slater constraint qualification holds there exists $\hat{x} \in K$ such that $g_i(\hat{x}) > 0$ for all $i = 1, 2, \ldots, m$. Since each g_i is continuous there exist $\delta > 0$ such that $x_p \in B(\hat{x}, \delta) \subset K$ and $g_i(x_p) > 0$ for all $i = 1, 2, \ldots, m$. Consider $x = \bar{x} + t(x_p - \bar{x})$ where $0 \leq t \leq 1$. Since K is convex, $x \in K$. Using definition (2.2) for Fréchet upper subdifferential, we get

$$\limsup_{t \to 0} \frac{g_i(x) - \langle -x_i^*, t(x_p - \bar{x}) \rangle}{t \parallel x_p - \bar{x} \parallel} \leq 0, \tag{3.9}$$

where we arrive the above inequality using $g_i(\bar{x})$ and $-x_i^* \in \hat{\partial}^+(g_i)(\bar{x})$. It shows that

$$g_i(x) + \langle x_i^*, t(x_p - \bar{x}) \rangle \leq o(t \parallel x_p - \bar{x} \parallel).$$

Using the fact that $g_i(x) \geq 0$, we get that

$$\langle x_i^*, t(x_p - \bar{x}) \rangle \leq o(t \parallel x_p - \bar{x} \parallel).$$

Taking $t \to 0$, we get

$$0 \leq \langle -x_i^*, x_p - \bar{x} \rangle \leq 0 \quad \text{for all} \quad x_p.$$

Last inequality follows from the assumption that $-\hat{\partial}^+ g_i(\bar{x}) \subset N_K(\bar{x})$. Hence $x_i^* = 0$, which contradicts the assumption (A). For converse part, assume there exists $z \in K$ such that $f(z) - f(x) > 0$. It implies that

$$0 > (-f)(z) - (-f)(\bar{x}) > \langle x_0^*, z - \bar{x} \rangle, \tag{3.10}$$

where $x_0^* \in \partial(-f)(\bar{x})$. Last inequality follows from the assumption of convexities of $(-f)$. $x_0^* \in \partial(-f)(\bar{x})$ implies that $-x_0^* \in \hat{\partial}^+(f)(\bar{x})$ or $x_0^* \in \hat{\partial}^+(-f)(\bar{x})$. Therefore from equations (3.4) and (3.10), we get

$$0 < \sum_{i \in I} \lambda_i \langle x_i^*, z - \bar{x} \rangle. \tag{3.11}$$

Using the Proposition (3) and considering $\lambda_i > 0$ we get

$$\sum_{i \in I} \lambda_i \langle x_i^*, z - \bar{x} \rangle \leq 0. \tag{3.12}$$

It implies that x_i^* is zero which contradicts the assumption (A). Hence $\bar{x}$ is the global minimizer. □

4 Conclusion

In this paper we extend the results of Dutta and Lalitha [3] to the continuous inequality constraints. Further, we avoid of using regularity assumption in [3]. Also our result considerable improves the results of Lasserre [4].

References

[1] Ben-Tal, A., Nemirovsky, A.: Lecture on Morden Convex Optimization: Analysis, Algorithims and Engineering Applications. SIAM, Philadelphia (2001).

[2] Clarke, F. H.: Optimization and Nonsmooth Analysis. Wiley, New York (1983).

[3] Dutta, J.,Lalitha, C. S.: Optimality conditions in convex optimization revisited, Optim. Lett.,7, 221-229 (2013).

[4] Lasserre, J.B.: On representation of the feasible set in convex optimization, Optim. Lett. 4, 1-5 (2010).

[5] Lasserre, J. B.: On convex optimization without convex representation, Optim. Lett., 5, 549-556, (2011).

[6] Mordukhovich, B. S.: variational Analysis and Generalized Differention I: Basic Theory, Springer, New York (2006).

[7] Mordukhovich, B. S.: variational Analysis and Generalized Differention II: Applications, Springer, New York (2006).

[8] Rockafellar, R.T., Wets, R.J.B.: Variational Analysis. Springer-Verlag, Berlin,(1998).

[9] schneider, R.: Convex Bodies, The Brunn-Minkowski Theory. Cambridge University Press. Cambridge (1994).